

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

In re B.C., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN'S
SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

D.P.,

Defendant and Appellant.

E036607

(Super.Ct.No. J183059)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Raymond L.
Haight, Temporary Judge. (Pursuant to Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21.) Affirmed.

Ellen J. Bacon, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

No appearance for Minor.

D.P. (father) is the father of B.C. (child) who is currently five years old. He appeals from orders terminating his parental rights. The child's mother is not a party to this appeal.

The child came to the attention of the San Bernardino County Department of Children's Services as a result of severe injuries he received while in the custody of his mother. Mother reportedly had a history of mental illness and substance abuse.

A petition was filed pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code, section 300, subdivisions (a) and (b).¹ On August 8, 2002, the child was detained with the foster parents with whom he has lived for the last two and one-half years, and who want to adopt him.

On September 9, 2002, the court sustained the petition and declared the child to be a dependent of the court. Reunification services were ordered for father.

At the first status review hearing the social worker recommended that father receive six more months of reunification services. However, father later notified the court that he was in state prison on a bad check charge with an August 2004 release date. At the April 29, 2004, hearing the court terminated reunification services and referred the case for a selection and implementation hearing. (§ 366.26.)

On September 1, 2004, father filed a section 388 petition alleging changed circumstances and requesting six more months of reunification services. He had been released from prison and was living with a girlfriend. The court summarily denied the

¹ All further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

petition finding that the petition failed to allege a prima facie case for changed circumstances or that the best interests of the child would be promoted by a change in the existing orders of the court.

At the hearing held on September 8, 2004, the court found that the child was adoptable and that none of the exceptions to adoption existed. The court then terminated both parents' parental rights.

Father appealed, and at his request we appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738. In that brief counsel sets forth a statement of the case, a summary of facts and potential issues on appeal. Counsel requested that we undertake an independent review of the entire record. We invited father to file a personal supplemental brief which he has done and which we have read and considered.

We have now completed our independent review of the record and find no arguable issues.

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

/s/ McKinster
J.

We concur:

/s/ Hollenhorst
Acting P.J.

/s/ Ward
J.